

REMARKS

Claim 1 has been amended. Claims 40-65 have been canceled. Claim 66-74 has been added. Claims 1-39 and 66-74 are pending. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of the application.

Election/Restrictions

In response to the election of Group I (claims 1-39) for prosecution, Applicant hereby cancels the non-elected claims 40-65.

Claim rejections under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) - Beatty and Chang

Claims 1-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Number 5,748,489 to Beatty et al. (hereinafter "Beatty") and U.S. Patent Number 5,706,516 to Chang et al. (hereinafter "Chang"). Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1-20 are patentable over Beatty and Chang.

As amended, claim 1 recites:

A method for a first process running on a computing device to communicate with a second process, the method comprising:

- creating a process table on the computing device;
- rendering the process table accessible to the first process;
- associating a Universally Unique Identifier (UUID) with the second process;
- creating an entry for the second process in the process table;
- associating the UUID of the second process with the process entry for the second process in the process table;
- configuring the second process to respond to a global event by releasing resources, reporting status, and performing a controlled shutdown;
- specifying a communications task to perform; and
- using the UUID of the second process to specify that the communications task be performed with respect to the second process.

Beatty describes a technique for parallel execution of a complex task partitioned into a plurality of entities. In particular, Beatty describes master and slave processes that are executed in parallel on multiple processors. Beatty also describes the use of a routing table to provide connectivity relationships. (See Beatty, col. 7, lines 25-55). However, the use of the routing table in Beatty appears to be independent of the generation of communications between the processes. It would appear that the routing table is merely used by the overall system to route communications between the processes and is not used for explicitly specifying the communications. Thus, Beatty fails to disclose or suggest the steps of "rendering the process table accessible to the first process"; "associating a Universally Unique Identifier (UUID) with the second process"; and "using UUID of the second process to specify that the communications task be performed with respect to the second process", as recited in claim 1.

The technique described by Beatty is used for communicating between master and slave processes. Nothing in Beatty discloses or suggests configuring the processes to respond to a particular event, such as for a controlled termination. Thus, Beatty also fails to disclose or suggest "configuring the second process to respond to a global event by releasing resources, reporting status, and performing a controlled shutdown", as recited in claim 1.

The Office Action acknowledges that Beatty does not teach a Universally Unique Identifier. But the Office Action argues that Chang teaches such an identifier. Chang describes a system for communicating messages among agent processes. Although Chang describes the use of identifiers to identify agent processes, Chang fails to disclose or suggest specifying a communication task for an agent process using information in a process table identified by a UUID associated with the process. Thus,

Chang also fails to disclose or suggest configuring the agent process to respond to a global event and to remedy the deficiencies of the Beatty reference.

For at least the above-identified reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 is patentable over Beatty and Chang, alone or in combination, and is allowable. Claims 2-20 depend from claim 1 and are also patentable over the references for at least the same reasons.

Claim rejections under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) – Beatty, Chang and Bala

Claims 21-39 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Beatty in view of Chang and further in view of Bala et al., "Process Groups: a mechanism for the coordination and communication among processes in the Venus collective communication library", 1993 IEEE, pg. 614-620 (hereinafter "Bala"). Applicant respectfully submits that claims 21-39 are patentable over Beatty, Chang and Bala.

Claim 21 recites:

A method for a first process running on a computing device to communicate with a second process and with a third process, the method comprising:

- creating a process table on the computing device;
- rendering the process table accessible to the first process;
- creating an entry for the second process in the process table;
- creating an entry for the third process in the process table;
- associating a group UUID with the process entry for the second process in the process table;
- associating the group UUID with the process entry for the third process in the process table;
- specifying a communications task to perform; and
- using the group UUID to specify that the communications task be performed with respect to the second and third processes.

As discussed above, Beatty describes the use of a routing table for passing communications between master and slave processes and Chang describes the use of a UUID to identify agent processes. However, neither references discloses or suggests specifying a communication task for a process using information in a process table identified by a UUID associated with the process. The references also fail to disclose or suggest the use of a group UUID to specify the communications task. These deficiencies are not remedied by Bala.

Bala describes a mechanism for the coordination of and communication among processes in a certain run-time communication library. In particular, Bala describes identifying a process group with a process group identifier (PGID). However, Bala fails to disclose or suggest identifying the process in a process table using the PGID or to specify a communications task using the PGID. Thus, Bala does not disclose or suggest the subject matter recited in claim 21.

For at least the above-identified reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 21 is patentable over Beatty, Chang and Bala, alone or in combination, and is allowable. Claims 22-39 depend from claim 21 and are also patentable over the references for at least the same reasons.

New Claims

Claims 66-74 have been added to the application. Applicant respectfully submits that new claims 66-74 are allowable for at least the same reasons presented above.

CONCLUSION

Accordingly, in view of the above amendment and remarks it is submitted that the claims are patentably distinct over the cited references and that all the rejections to the claims have been overcome. Reconsideration of the above Application is requested. Based on the foregoing, Applicants respectfully requests that the pending claims be allowed, and that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. If the Examiner believes, after this response, that the application is not in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the Applicant's attorney at the telephone number listed below.

If this response is not considered timely filed and if a request for an extension of time is otherwise absent, Applicants hereby request any necessary extension of time. If there is a fee occasioned by this response, including an extension fee that is not covered by the enclosed fee transmittal, please charge any deficiency to Deposit Account No. 50-0463.

Respectfully submitted,

Microsoft Corporation

Date: August 16, 2005

Microsoft Corporation
One Microsoft Way
Redmond, WA 98052

By: 

Thomas Wong, Reg. No.: 48,577
Attorney for Applicants
Direct telephone (425) 707-3591

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING OR TRANSMISSION [37 CFR 1.8(a)]

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being:

☒ deposited with the United States Postal Service on the date shown below with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Mail Stop Amendment, Commissioner for Patents, P. O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

August 16, 2005

Date


Signature

Thomas Wong

Type or Print Name

Application Number: 09/872,257

Attorney Docket Number: 160421.01